



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/973,083	10/10/2001	John S. Hendricks	SEDN/5205	5151
56015 7590 04/23/2008 PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, LLP/ SEDNA PATENT SERVICES, LLC 595 SHREWSBURY AVENUE SUITE 100 SHREWSBURY, NJ 07702				
EXAMINER				
SHEPARD, JUSTIN E				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2623				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/23/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/973,083

Applicant(s)

HENDRICKS ET AL.

Examiner

Justin E. Shepard

Art Unit

2623

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 61-65 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 61-65 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 3/13/08 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/13/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Page 6, last paragraph continuing onto page 7:

The applicant argues that Vogel does not teach locally overriding a group assigned rule, but instead teaches overriding a classification inputted by the user. Referring to column 3, line 57 to column 4, line 5 Vogel teaches that the classifications are encoded into the video signals. The classifications can be censored by the viewers when the user inputs the correct classifications (column 4, lines 21-32). While the user does input a classification number, this input is used to override the broadcast channel being currently viewed by the user. This override is interpreted as a local override of a rule, as a program classification is viewed as a group assigned rule.

Page 7, second paragraph:

The applicant argues that Vogel does not teach overriding a group assigned rule. The examiner is interpreting the classification of video programs as being a group assigned rule because depending on who is viewing the television, a program may or may not be viewed by the viewer depending on the classification inputted by the user.

Page 7, last paragraph continuing onto page 8:

The applicant argues that Vogel teaches away from the invention disclosed by McKenna as McKenna discloses a device without giving the user the ability to control the tuning of programs, while Vogel does teach controlling the tuner. Vogel teaches controlling the tuning of programs through the censoring of the broadcasted signal. The examiner interprets this as being analogous to the system disclosed by McKenna, as McKenna discloses a system that tailors the programming being viewed to specific users (column 11, lines 27-32) which Vogel then teaches can be overridden by the user. The difference of McKenna and Vogel, is that McKenna discloses that specific advertisements are transmitted to a user while Vogel teaches censoring programs from being viewed by certain viewers. The examiner interprets a commercial short version of a video program, and parents may want certain advertisements to be censored to their children, such as alcohol, tobacco, or even certain programming that might be offensive.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 61-65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over McKenna in view of Vogel.

Referring to claim 61, McKenna discloses a system, comprising:

a processor located remotely from a viewer's set top terminal at an operations center (figure 1, parts 17 and 24) for generating a plurality or group assignment rules based on viewing information (column 7, lines 18-19; column 11, lines 27-32)

a switching engine for receiving a plurality of group assignment rules, wherein said plurality of group assignment rules associate a plurality of set top terminals to a group based on a target category (column 10, lines 64-68; column 11, lines 1-4) and a switching plan (column 11, lines 11-13) and for switching at least one program channel to at least one feeder channel according to the switching plan (column 11, lines 21-26), the feeder channel being an ancillary channel for providing a plurality of advertisements based on a group assignment in the plurality of group assignment rules (column 10, lines 50-60); and a data collection engine for collecting information including advertisements watched data (column 7, lines 18-19; Note: as the system watches the channel that the system is tuned to, it would keep track of when the system tuned into a

substitute channel) and any changes to the plurality of group assignment rules for use in future advertising targeting (column 11, lines 27-32).

McKenna does not disclose a system comprising a group assignment rules processor engine for managing the group assignment rules associated with a viewer's set top terminal by allowing a viewer to review which group a viewers set top terminal is assigned to by said processor according to a respective group assignment rule of said plurality of group assignment rules and by processing any input from the viewer to locally modify or override of any of the remotely assigned group assignment rules associated with a viewer's set top terminal.

In an analogous art, Vogel teaches a system comprising a group assignment rules processor engine for managing the group assignment rules associated with a viewer's set top terminal by allowing a viewer to review which group a viewers set top terminal is assigned to by said processor (column 5, lines 8-12 and 20-26) according to a respective group assignment rule of said plurality of group assignment rules and by processing any input from the viewer to locally modify or override of any of the remotely assigned group assignment rules associated with a viewer's set top terminal (column 5, lines 37-42).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to add the rules managing and overriding taught by Vogel to the system disclosed by McKenna. The motivation would have been to enable the user to block out certain programming not deemed appropriate for certain viewers.

Claim 64 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 61.

Referring to claim 62, McKenna discloses a system of claim 61, further comprising: a memory for storing the plurality of group assignment rules (column 11, lines 11-13) and the advertisements (figure 1, parts 13 and 14).

Claim 65 is rejected on the same grounds as claim 62.

Referring to claim 63, McKenna discloses a system of claim 61, wherein the data collection engine includes an automatic data collection module (column 7, lines 18-19) and a manual data collection module (column 7, lines 28-38).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Justin E. Shepard whose telephone number is (571) 272-5967. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris Kelley can be reached on (571) 272-7331. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2623

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Chris Kelley/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2623

JS